<u>REMARKS</u>

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-4 remain in the application.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102" on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1 and 2 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,425,022 to Clark et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 specifies, through said control bus, said control station allocating a logical channel to said reception station. Claim 2 similarly specifies: allocating a logical channel to the reception station through the control bus. Applicants believe it is clear that Clark et al. do not teach such features.

Clark et al. teach that the logical channel is <u>not</u> allocated to a reception station, but rather to <u>an incoming channel or a data stream</u> (see, for example, the next to the last sentence of the abstract). Fig. 1 of Clark et al. show that the data bus 1 contains six lines for device number selection and eight lines for the byte slot and the logical channel. If the logical channels were allocated to the devices attached to the data bus, there would be no need to provide two more lines for the logical channel than for the device number selection. Further, there is no need to provide logical channels allocated to the reception station

since the devices connected to the data bus 1 are already addressed by the device number lines. Therefore, it is clear that Clark does not teach allocating logical channels to reception stations. Rather, the logical channels are used to set byte positions or bit positions of the outgoing data frame, as described in the second half of the next to last sentence of the abstract. Claims 1 and 2 are not anticipated by Clark et al. for these reasons.

Additionally, claim 2 also includes a step of interchanging data between the control station and the reception station <u>for as long as the logical channel remains allocated to the reception station and is called</u>. Applicants believe it is clear that Clark et al. do not teach such a feature.

Clark et al. show a lookup Table 4 in Fig. 9 in which data exchange continues with the same destination device, but with different logical channel numbers LCN#. In this figure, a source device 5 sends bytes 1 to 159 to destination devices 1, 2, 3, 4. Bytes 2 and 3 follow each other immediately and are sent to the same destination device 2, but have different logical channel numbers LCN# of 1 and 8. Clearly, <u>no logical channel is allocated to a reception station</u>, but rather the logical channel is used as a position in a data stream which is required for the transmission of interleave bytes (see column 2, lines 61 to 66). Further, in contrast to claim 2, the logical channel <u>does not remain allocated</u> during the data interchange. Claim 2 is also not anticipated by Clark et al. for these additional reasons.

Claims 1 and 2 also define a data bus operated in a multiplex mode and connected to the control station and to the reception station. Applicants believe that Clark does not teach a data bus operating in a multiplex mode. As can be clearly seen from the data bus 1 shown in Fig. 1, the data bus 1 has eight data lines and six device number lines which are used for addressing the devices A1 … Am and P1 … Pn connected to the data bus. The data lines and the address lines are arranged in parallel. In contrast to this, claims 1 and 2 refer to a multiplex mode. Although claims 1 and 2 are not limited to a particular multiplex mode, the Examiner may refer to the application, which describes a time division multiplex mode as an example. In this example of a multiplex mode, the data bus is used by the master first to transfer an address of the slave to be solicited and next, the data are interchanged.

The Examiner might argue that every data bus is operated in a multiplex mode since several different components, such as, the aggregate switch modules A1 … Am and the port switches P1 … Pn can be freely connected to each other by means of the addressing and therefore a multiplexer function is provided. However, applicants believe that one of ordinary skill in the art will not interpret the term "multiplex mode" of claims 1 and 2 as basically duplicating the information already presented by the reference to a "data bus". Rather applicants believe that he will see a technical feature behind this, which further specifies the data bus as operating in a time multiplex mode in which the address is first transferred and after that, data follows on the same bus lines. In other words, the phrase "multiplex mode" presents an additional technical

feature over the general features usually associated with a data bus and distinguishes it from data buses having a data bus and an address bus in parallel to each other, as is the case in Clark et al. Applicants believe that claims 1 and 2 are also not anticipated by Clark et al. for these reasons.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 4 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 3 and 4 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,425,022 to Clark et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,674,853 B1 to Ezell et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Even if there were a suggestion to combine the teachings, applicants believed the invention defined by claims 3 and 4 would not have been obtained because of the deficiencies in the teaching of Clark et al. discussed above in regard to claim 2.

Additionally, claim 3 defines a step of soliciting the reception station through the control bus by calling the logical channel at a <u>same time</u> as a transfer of the data, and claim 4 defines a step of soliciting the reception station through the control bus by calling the logical channel <u>before</u> a transfer of the data. Applicants believe that Ezell et al. do not teach such limitations.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 1.

Claims 1 and 2 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The

dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are

ultimately dependent on claim 2.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-4 are

solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable,

counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible,

patentable language can be worked out.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within

a period of one month pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of $120.00 in

accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Please charge any other fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16

and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-

1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Laurence A. Greenberg/
Laurence A. Greenberg
(Reg. No. 29,308)

MPW:cgm

September 28, 2007

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101